

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 38 are pending in this application; Claims 23 – 33 have been allowed over the prior art of record; Claims 1 – 10, 13, 15 – 18, 22 and 28 are amended in several particulars to define Applicant's invention and thereby assist the Examiner to expedite the compact prosecution of the instant application.

Drawings were objected because FIG. 3 was not labeled as "Prior Art". Accordingly, FIG. 3 has been labeled as "Prior Art" as is suggested by the Examiner in order to overcome this objection.

The Abstract of the disclosure was objected because of the usage of the term "means". Accordingly, the abstract has been amended to overcome this objection.

The Title of this invention was objected because it is not sufficiently described. The new title of "A HIGH SPEED COLOR VIDEO PRINTER FOR PRINTING COLOR IMAGE DATA IN SUCCESSIVE COLUMNS DURING BLANKING INTERVALS OF A VIDEO RASTER SCAN" is hereby submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The disclosure was objected because the description of FIG. 1–3 of a conventional color video printer should be discussed in the "background of the invention." This objection is

respectfully traversed on the ground the detailed description regarding FIG. 1-3 should be discussed in the detailed description of the specification rather than in the "background of the invention."

Claims 1 – 22 and 34 – 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, **second** paragraph, as being indefinite. Accordingly, claims 1 – 10, 13, 15 – 18, 22 and 28 have been amended in those instances as kindly suggested by the Examiner in order to obviate this rejection. For instances:

With regard to the rejection of claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to refer to only one memory means in order to avoid the confusion between the internal memory and the memory means.

With regard to the rejection of claim 2, claim 2 has been amended to delete the hyphen as is kindly suggested by the Examiner.

With regard to the rejection of claims 4 and 8 however, the term "comprised of" is actually well established in claim drafting, and should not be seen as indefinite by the Examiner. For the purpose of expediting prosecution of this application however, claims 4 and 8 have been amended to use the term "wherein" as is suggested by the Examiner in order to render this rejection moot.

With regard to the rejection of claim 5, the term "operative to" has been deleted in favor

of the term "operates."

With regard to the rejection of claim 7, claim 7 has been amended to refer to the storage of the "first data representative of said video raster scan."

With regard to the rejection of claim 9, this rejection is respectfully traversed on the ground that claim 9 was written in a permissible "mean-plus-function" language as is accorded under 35 U.S.C. §112, the **sixth** paragraph. Accordingly, there is no need for Applicant to specify the structure to support the recited functions.

With regard to the rejection of claim 10, claim 10 has been amended to delete the plural means as is noted by the Examiner in order to render this rejection moot.

With regard to the rejection of claim 15, claim 15 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "displaying means."

With regard to the rejection of claim 17, again, claim 17 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "said chrominance components" and the A/D converter. Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion that there is no relationship between the first, second, and third selection signals, mode signals, and the color video data however. The traversal is based on the ground all these signals are control signals used to control operation of the "first switching

means", "second searching means", "data converting means" and "third switching means" of a color video printer; and consequently, there is an inherent relationship existed between these signals and the color video printer.

Finally, with regard to the rejection claim 18, the rejection is traversed for the same reason as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing amendment to these claims, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections to be withdrawn.


No fee is incurred by this response.

A Letter to the Office Draftsman accompanies this response. Indication in subsequent Office correspondence of the acceptance to the drawing corrections proposed in the Letter, is requested to enable Applicant to timely arrange for the corrections to be made prior to the date for payment of any issue fee.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be

allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

Suite 425
1511 "K" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-5740

Folio: P53521
Date: 8/16/94
I.D.: REB/HB/kf